

To: Katherine Garner[KGarner@ceip.org]
From: Albright, David
Sent: Fri 11/8/2013 6:13:46 PM
Subject: RE: Question on June 2011 Review of California Class II UIC Program

Hi Katherine, I'm sorry that I was not able to respond in a timelier fashion. I'm now out of the office until Tuesday (Mon. is holiday), but I will try to make contact with you then to discuss the DOGGR UIC program and EPA's program review. I hope that timing is okay.

Take care,

David

From: Katherine Garner <KGarner@ceip.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 07, 2013 11:54 AM
To: Albright, David
Subject: Question on June 2011 Review of California Class II UIC Program

Hello David,

I'm contacting to you ask about the concern you voiced in your California Class II Underground Injection Control Program Review (June 2011) that California does not adequately protect USDW. I read both your concerns and California's DOGGR response to your report and am curious to know what the follow through on this was. California's response seemed to indicate that they saw no problem with the difference between their definition of freshwater and the federal definition of a USDW, but that in 2013 they would review and see if changes needed to be made. Are you aware of any changes that California has made in their definition of freshwater or their requirements for emplacing cement at the base of freshwater in injection wells? Do they still afford this extra protection to freshwater but not USDWs?

Thank you so much for your time,

Kate Garner

Katherine Garner
Junior Fellow, Energy and Climate Program
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
P +1 202 939 2285 | kgarner@ceip.org

The Global Think Tank

Experience the new [CarnegieEndowment.org](https://www.CarnegieEndowment.org). Fresh look, same insight.